Remarks

Claims 1 to 9, 11, to 15 and 17 to 24 remain in this Application.

The description has been amended to conform with the claims and the original disclosure. No new matter has been added in this regard.

Claim 1 has been rejected as being anticipated by Chuang. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is directed to a tilt mechanism comprising "a first tubular member..." and a "a second tubular member...". Chuang does not describe or teach such a structure. Specifically, the female joint 3 is a solid member and not a tubular member. Likewise, the male joint 2 is a solid member and not a tubular member. Accordingly, a rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Chuang is not warranted pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

In order to advance the prosecution of this Application, claim 1 has been amended to recite that at least one of the pin and catch of tilt mechanism is "moveable coaxially relative to each other" to release the pin from a recess in the catch. Chuang does not describe or teach such a structure. As described, Chuang provides a push rod 4 that is moveable transversely of the teeth in the male joint 2 and not coaxially. For this additional reason, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Chuang pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Further, claim 4 requires a spring means to include (1) a coil spring abutting said pin and (2) a plate secured in said other of said tubular members and abutting said coil

spring". As can be seen in Fig. 3 of Chuang, the spring 5 abuts a projection 411 of the push plate 41 on one side and a wall of the female joint 3 on the opposite side. There is no plate. Accordingly, claim 4 is believed to be further allowable over Chuang pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form. As such, claim 5 has been rejected as being anticipated by Chuang. Issue is taken in this respect.

Claim 5 requires a tilt mechanism to comprise "a first tubular member..." and "a second tubular member...". As noted above, Chuang does not describe or teach such a structure.

Claim 5 further requires a "catch mounted in one of said members and projecting into the other of said members..." and "a pin slidably mounted in said other of said tubular members...said pin being moveable away from said catch to allow said other tubular member to tilt...". As can be seen in Figs. 2 and 3 of Chuang, the push rod 4 remains within the plane of the male joint 2. There is no movement of the push rod 4 away from the male joint 2. Instead, the push rod 4 remains within the plane of the male joint 2 and simply moves sideways to align the notches 42, 43 of the push rod with the teeth 22 of the male joint 2.

In view of the above, a rejection of claim 5 as being anticipated by Chuang is not warranted pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claims 6 to 8 depend from claim 5 and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Further, claim 7 requires the tubular members to have "contoured interfitting end surfaces to define a smooth cylindrical contour therebetween with said tubular members in alignment with each other". The Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to modify

the Chuang structure with the teachings of Leonard in order to have smooth cylindrical contoured surfaces therebetween. Issue is taken in this respect. If the male joint 2 and female joint 3 were provided with smooth cylindrical surfaces therebetween, this would eliminate the locating teeth 22 of the male joint and thus defeat the purposes of Chuang. Accordingly, the proposed modification of Chuang is contrary to the teachings of Chuang. Accordingly, a rejection of claim 7 as being unpatentable over Chuang in view of Leonard is not warranted pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claim 9 contains recitations similar to claim 1 and believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claims 11 to 14 depend from claim 9 and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 12 contains recitations similar to claim 4 and is believed to be further allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 13 contains recitations similar to claim 5 as noted above and is believed to be further allowable over the references of record.

Claim 14 requires the pin to have a "rounded head at each end projecting from said other tubular member for manual contact thereof". Chuang is void of any such structure. In this regard, the Examiner alleges that the push rod 4 of Chuang has a rounded head 41 at one end and rounded edges on the opposite end. Issue is taken in this respect. First, as can be seen in Figs. 2 and 3 of Chuang, the push plate 41 of Chuang is flush with the outside of the female joint 3 and does not project from the female joint 3. Second, the opposite end of the push rod 4 is flat. When in the position of Fig. 2, the flat end of the push rod 4 is recessed within the female joint 3 and when in the position illustrated in Fig. 3 flat end is not intended for manual contact. Accordingly,

a rejection of claim 14 as being anticipated by Chuang is not warranted pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claim 15 contains recitations similar to claim 9 and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claims 17 to 24 depend from claim 15 and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 17 contains recitations similar to claim 4 and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 18 requires the plate within the second tubular member to be "frictionally secured within and transversely of said second member". Since Chuang does not have any plate, Chuang does not have a plate that is frictionally secured within and transversely of the second member. Accordingly, a rejection of claim 18 as being anticipated by Chuang is not warranted pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claim 23 contains recitations similar to claim 7 and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 24 requires the second tubular member to have "a pair of oppositely disposed elongated slots" and requires the pin to project through the slots "for grasping thereof". Chuang specifically describes the push rod 4 as being shaped as the rectangular hole 332 and its cross section so as to fit therein. (Column 2, line 18-20). Accordingly, there is no teaching in Chuang that the rectangular hole 332 is elongated or that the push rod 4 projects through the hole 332 for grasping thereof. Accordingly, a rejection of claim 24 as being anticipated by Chuang is not warranted pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis C. Hand
Reg. No. 22,280
CARELLA, BYRNE BAIN, GILFILLAN,
CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN
Five Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Phone: 973-994-1700
Fax: 973-994-1744

#197270 v1

OFFICIAL